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# Overview of the Training Workshop Series

Training Workshop Series Purpose and Goals

This series of five training sessions, an Orientation to the new evaluation framework followed by four 1-hour workshops, is designed to prepare educators without evaluator responsibilities to implement the new Massachusetts educator evaluation system through the following intended outcomes:

* Introduce educators to the key components of the new evaluation framework.
* Support educators in developing a common understanding of the new educator evaluation framework and the opportunities for professional growth and development using the Massachusetts Model System.
* Provide participants with opportunities to engage in the first three steps of the 5-Step Evaluation Cycle

The training sessions will accomplish these goals through the use of detailed facilitator guides and participant handouts that connect to Model System resources. All materials are available online at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/teachers/>.

Audience

The audience for each session includes school-level educators without evaluator responsibilities, such as classroom teachers and specialized instructional support personnel.

Timing and Structure

Each session is one hour in length. The Orientation session introduces participants to the key components of the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework. The subsequent workshops provide participants with the opportunity to unpack performance rubrics, conduct a self-assessment, develop S.M.A.R.T. goals, and strategically identify sources of evidence, with each workshop structured to result in concrete deliverables associated with each educator’s evaluation. Homework assignments help participants extend and apply their learning to the next workshop. ESE designed each session to be delivered by a school administrator or teacher leader during common planning time or comparable in-school collaborative meeting period.

List of Training Sessions

**Orientation.** The Orientation describes the most important aspects of the evaluation framework. The Orientation includes topics such as the purpose of the evaluation framework, the two ratings everyone will receive, the 5-Step evaluation cycle, and key characteristics of the evaluation rubric.

**Workshop 1: Rubric Review.** The first workshop introduces the basic structure and terminology of the performance rubrics and gives participants an opportunity to examine the rubric components.

**Workshop 2: Self-Assessment.** The second workshop engages participants in Step 1 of the 5-Step Cycle—self-assessment. Participants will learn about the key characteristics of a high quality self-assessment and have an opportunity to complete their own self-assessments.

**Workshop 3: S.M.A.R.T. Goals.** The third workshop engages participants in Step 2 of the 5-Step Cycle cycle—the development of student learning goals and professional practice goals that are S.M.A.R.T. with clear benchmarks for success.

**Workshop 4: Gathering Evidence.** The fourth workshop introduces participants to the three types of evidence required in an evaluation, and provides tips and strategies for determining high quality artifacts of practice and measures of student learning. Participants will identify sources of evidence related to practice outlined in their educator plans to demonstrate performance.

# Preparing for Workshop 4

## Workshop Description

This facilitator guide is designed to support lead teachers and other administrators who are leading this workshop with small teams of teachers. Participants should have already completed the minimum required training for educators (i.e., the Orientation session and Workshops 1, 2 and 3) prior to completing Workshop 4.

This 1 hour workshop aims to provide teachers with the time, information, and resources they need to identify artifacts of practice aligned to activities outlined in their educator plans.

## Intended Outcomes

At the end of this workshop, participants will be able to:

* Explain the three types of evidence required by the regulations and identify concrete examples of each.
* Describe characteristics of high-quality sources of evidence.
* Identify artifacts of practice and measures of student learning aligned to activities outlined in their educator plans.

## Agenda

1. Review Objectives for Today’s Workshop (2 Minutes)
2. Learning Activity 1: Three Types of Evidence (13 Minutes)
3. Learning Activity 2: Identifying Sources of Evidence (20-25 Minutes)
4. Learning Activity 3: Identifying Your Own Evidence (20 Minutes)
5. Exit Ticket/Homework

## Equipment and Materials

Participant handouts for this workshop have been provided in the *Participant Handout Packet*. Before the workshop, facilitators should complete the following tasks:

* Communicate to participants that they should come prepared to the workshop with the following:
	+ Completed Goal Setting Form (or comparable goals document)
	+ Completed Educator Plan (or comparable form)
* Provide copies of the *Participant Handout Packet*

## Model System Resources

Facilitators should familiarize themselves ahead of time with the educator evaluation framework in general and the categories of evidence required in an evaluation in particular. Model System resources can be found on ESE’s website, at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/>. Specific resources that are useful to review before facilitating this workshop include:

[*Part II: School-Level Planning and Implementation Guide*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartII.pdf)

* Step 3: Implementation of the Plan ([pp. 32-39](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartII.pdf#page=36))
* Conditions for Readiness ([p. 34](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartII.pdf#page=38))
* Considerations for Planning ([pp. 35-36](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartII.pdf#page=39))
* [Educator Plan Form](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/evalforms/EdPlanForm.pdf) (Appendix A) or locally adopted form

## Evaluation Training Resources

Additional evaluation training resources can be found on ESE’s website at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/>. Specific resources that are useful to review before facilitating this workshop include:

* [Training Module 5: Gathering Evidence](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/modules/)

# Facilitator Guide

## I. Welcome & Objectives (2 minutes)

* **Facilitator Note**: it’s important that participants attend this workshop having already completed their educator goals, and if possible, their educator plans.

Review the intended outcomes and agenda for today’s workshop.

|  |
| --- |
| *Explain:*At the end of this session, participants will be able to:* Explain the three types of evidence required by the regulations and identify concrete examples of each.
* Describe characteristics of high-quality sources of evidence.
* Identify artifacts of practice and measures of student learning aligned to activities outlined in their educator plans.

Over the course of the next 60 minutes, we will become familiar with the three types of evidence required in an evaluation (Learning Activity 1). Using a sample teacher’s educator plan, we will also have an opportunity to see what it means to select high quality artifacts of practice and measures of student learning that support practice associated with goal attainment (Learning Activity 2). Finally, everyone will have an opportunity to identify sources of evidence aligned to activities outlined in their own educator plans, related to both goal attainment and the Standards and Indicators of educator practice (Learning Activity 3 and Exit Ticket/Homework). |

## II. Learning Activity 1 (13 minutes)

Three Types of Evidence

Give participants 5 minutes to read Handout 1: *Three Types of Evidence for Educator Evaluation* (pp. 2-3 of Participant Handouts for Workshop 4) and review the following three categories of evidence:

* Judgments based on observations and artifacts of practice
* Multiple measures of student growth
* Additional sources that provide relevant information on an educator’s practice related to one or more performance standards, including student feedback

Once participants have finished the excerpt, check for understanding by asking educators to share their answers to the following guiding questions (also available on p. 4 of the Participant Handouts packet):

**Guiding Questions**

1. What aspects of educator practice does each category of evidence seek to demonstrate?
2. How might you use strategically selected sources of evidence to “tell the story behind the numbers?” How is this valuable to you as an educator?
3. What type of information about educator practice might student surveys yield that is different from artifacts of practice or observational evidence?

**Key Discussion Points and Take-Away:**

* + Multiple categories of evidence provide a more comprehensive and accurate picture of practice than observations alone.
	+ Artifacts should be naturally occurring products of practice and never be manufactured simply for evaluative purposes.
	+ The educator has the opportunity to frame a conversation about practice through thoughtfully selected artifacts of practice and measures of student learning that tell a story of professional growth and student learning and lead to robust conversations between the educator and his/her evaluator.
	+ The second category of evidence—Measures of Student Learning, Growth & Achievement—informs both the Summative Performance Rating and the Student Impact Rating. With regard to the Summative Performance Rating, these measures are tied to an individual educator’s goals, as well as their practice associated with one or more Standards; these measures can therefore vary from educator to educator.

Measures of student learning, growth and achievement used to determine the Student Impact Rating may differ from those used for the Summative Performance Rating because (1) they must be comparable across similarly situated educators, and (2) they must include state assessment data when applicable, as well as district-determined measures.

## III. Learning Activity 2 (20-25 minutes)

Identifying Sources of Evidence

The purpose of this activity is to help participants learn how to identify high-quality, authentic sources of evidence of practice in support of their evaluation.

* Participant Materials:
	+ Handout 2 and Handout 3 (pp. 6-13 of the *Participant Handout Packet*)
* **Facilitator Note**: example sources of evidence aligned to Handout 3 are located in Appendix A of this facilitator guide. These are for the facilitator’s reference and are meant to help guide, not prescribe, discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| *Explain:*One of the objectives of the new educator evaluation framework is to provide educators and evaluators with a more comprehensive, accurate, systematic way to assess practice. Artifacts and measures of student learning represent an incredibly rich source of evidence related to practice, particularly when one considers the broad array of artifacts available to an educator. These sources of evidence also pose a dilemma to educators—how do they identify the best representations of practice without filling a wheelbarrow full of artifacts?When thinking about selecting and organizing sources of evidence, educators should consider the following three tenets: * **Artifacts and measures of student learning should be a sample that demonstrates educator performance and impact**. Educators should focus on providing a representative sample of evidence: too many artifacts can make the process unwieldy; too few will not give an accurate picture of practice.
* **Evidence within each artifact should be clearly tied to educator goals and/or the Standards and Indicators.** Educators should be prepared to make these connections during the evaluation process.
* **Evidence selection should be strategic**. Consider how multiple sources of evidence might tell a story (e.g. a lesson plan, results from a formative assessment, student work samples, and a second lesson plan could demonstrate how you adjusted practice based on student data), or how one artifact could present evidence of practice associated with multiple Standards and Indicators.
 |

Give participants 3-5 minutes to read Handout 2 (pp. 6-7 of Participant Handouts for Workshop 4), which includes a brief excerpt about evidence selection, followed by a hypothetical list of evidence sources for a 6th grade science teacher, Mr. Tom Wilson*. Be prepared to pause for brief discussion before moving on to Handout 3.*

After reading Handout 2, engage in a brief discussion about the list of “possible sources of evidence” Tom Wilson could collect.

**Guiding Questions**

1. Does this appear to be a representative sample of Mr. Wilson’s performance? A strategic selection of artifacts?
2. Can you clearly tie each of these items to Mr. Wilson’s goals, and/or the Standards and Indicators?

After a brief discussion, prompt participants to find a partner and turn to Handout 3 (pp. 10-12 in their Participant Handouts packet). Ask participants to take 10 minutes to read Mr. Wilson’s educator plan, which is based on his two goals. Point out the fact that there is a space in the third column aligned to each action step for “Evidence.” Using the list of “possible sources of evidence” in Handout 2 as a starting point, direct each pair to identify one or more sources of evidence for each action step that would demonstrate success in meeting each outcome.

* **Facilitator Note**: encourage pairs to be creative and not limit themselves to the list of evidence sources on Handout 2. Helpful prompt: “What particular source of evidence or set of artifacts would *best* demonstrate success related to each action step?”
* **Facilitator Note**: Give participants a 5-minute warning so they can move through this activity efficiently, with enough time to engage in a discussion at its conclusion.

When participants have completed the activity, engage in a brief discussion about how and why they chose specific sources of evidence for Mr. Wilson’s evaluation. (Guiding questions are available on p. 13 of the Participant Handout Packet.)

**Guiding Questions**

1. How does your selection of evidence sources for Mr. Wilson differ from the original list of possible sources? Did you add any items that he didn’t consider? Disregard others?
2. This activity asked you to identify sources of evidence associated with Mr. Wilson’s goals, as represented through this educator plan. Which artifacts and student data sources might provide evidence of practice associated with one or more of the four Standards? (Curriculum, Planning & Assessment; Teaching All Students; Family & Community Engagement; Professional Culture)
3. How might this evidence collection process contribute to Mr. Wilson’s reflection of his professional practice? The performance of his students?
4. How will these particular artifacts contribute to making Mr. Wilson’s conversations with his evaluator about his practice more meaningful and productive?

**Key Discussion Points and Take-Away:**

* + Evidence should represent a comprehensive yet focused picture of practice
	+ The identification and collection of artifacts themselves should support your work—what story do these artifacts tell? What can you learn about your practice from the types of data you choose to collect?
	+ Evidence of performance associated with your goals can also demonstrate practice related to one or more Standards and Indicators

## IV. Learning Activity 3 (20 minutes)

Identifying Your Own Evidence

* Participant Materials:
	+ Handout 4 (pg. 14 of Participant Handouts Packet)
	+ Completed Goal Setting Form (or comparable goals document)
	+ Completed Educator Plan (or comparable form)

|  |
| --- |
| *Explain:*Identifying and gathering evidence is an integral part of Step 3 of the 5-Step Cycle of Evaluation: Implementation. For Learning Activity 4, everyone will have the opportunity to identify artifacts and measures of student learning directly related to activities outlined in their Educator Plans.  |

* **Facilitator Note**: Facilitators are encouraged to provide copies of the entire Model Classroom Teacher and/or Specialized Instructional Support Rubric(s) to participants for this activity (or locally-adapted rubrics). Rubrics can help guide the selection of artifacts, particularly when considering how artifacts of practice can demonstrate evidence associated with educator goals *and* the Standards and Indicators of practice.

Before getting started, make sure that everyone has their Educator Plans—either in draft or final form. If they have yet to complete their Educator Plans, participants can use their Goal Setting Forms from Workshop 3 to engage in this activity.

Direct participants to Handout 4 and briefly review the activity. Draw their attention to and read aloud the following two key questions:

* *Will this particular artifact or group of artifacts show what I’m trying to demonstrate?*
	+ Example: a classroom roster may reveal attendance on one particular Friday, but an analysis of six rosters from the six consecutive Fridays will demonstrate a pattern of declining absentee rates.
* *Will this collection of artifacts and measures of student learning help me tell a story of professional growth and development, as well as student learning and achievement?*
	+ Example: through the submission of an analysis of Friday lab absentee rates, lesson plans for four consecutive unit labs, and related unit assessment data from chronically absent and underperforming students, I can demonstrate correlations between changes to my instructional approach to better engage all students, improved attendance rates, and improved student learning.

Using Handout 4 as a guide, direct participants to work individually with their educator plans and/or goal setting forms to start identifying concrete, targeted artifacts of practice and measures of student learning, growth & achievement that will demonstrate relevant practice at each stage of the educator plan.

## V. Exit Ticket/Homework

Aligning Evidence to Standards and Indicators

* **Facilitator Note**: This can be presented as an **“**Exit Ticket**”** or **“**Homework”activity, depending on how much time is left in the workshop.
* Participant Materials:
	+ Handout 5 (pg. 16 of Participant Handouts Packet)
	+ Annotated Educator Plan Form from Learning Activity IV
	+ Model System Classroom Teacher and/or SISP Rubric (or locally-adapted rubrics)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Explain:*You’ve now spent some time selecting targeted, high-quality sources of evidence that will demonstrate practice related to activities outlined in your educator plan, all of which will help you pursue your goals. Your educator plan is the jumping off point for evidence identification and collection. The next step is to identify how and where each artifact or measure of student learning identified on your plan reflects practice associated with one or more Standard and Indicator. It’s highly likely that simply identifying evidence associated with your two goals has already yielded evidence tied to several Standards and Indicators.For example, several of Mr. Wilson’s artifacts and measures of student learning will likely yield evidence of practice associated with several Standards and Indicators:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evidence Source | Standard/Indicator |
| * Notes from meetings with the ELL specialist
* Formative assessment data results and analysis
 | 🡪Indicator I.B (Assessment)🡪Indicator I.C (Analysis)🡪Indicator IV.C: (Collaboration) |
|  |  |
| * Select lesson plans reflecting new instructional strategies
 | 🡪Indicator I.A (Curriculum and Planning)🡪Indicator II.A (Instruction)🡪Indicator II.D (Expectations) |

 |

Direct participants to begin this activity either during the workshop or on their own as a homework assignment.

* Suggested ESE Model System Resources & Tools:
	+ Educator Collection of Evidence Form
	+ Artifact Cover Page

(available at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/evalforms/>)

# Appendix A: Learning Activity 2

*Completed Sample of Handout 3*

# Educator Plan Form

Educator—Name/Title: T. Wilson, sixth-grade science teacher

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: P. Randolph, principal

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: N/A

School(s): George Washington Middle School

Educator Plan: [x]  Self-Directed Growth Plan [ ]  Directed Growth Plan

[ ]  Developing Educator Plan [ ]  Improvement Plan\*

Plan Duration: [ ]  Two-Year [x]  One-Year [ ]  Less than a year

Start Date: September 19, 2011 End Date: June 15, 2012

X **Educator** **Goal Setting form with final goals is attached to the Educator Plan**.

Some activities may apply to the pursuit of multiple goals or types of goals (student learning or professional practice). Attach additional pages as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Identify student knowledge level at the beginning of each unit using a formative assessment. | * 2006 MA Science Curriculum Framework
* 2011 MA Revised Curriculum Framework for ELA and Literacy (Standards for Literacy in Science)
 | * Frequency: Prior to each unit
* Process benchmark: Development/refinement of formative assessments for each unit
* Outcome benchmark: Analysis of student knowledge level related to content standard(s) using formative assessment results prior to each unit

**Evidence:** pre-unit assessment results for Life Science, Earth Science, and Physical Science units; pre-lab reports (2 labs per unit)\_\_\_\_\_ |

\*Additional detail may be attached if needed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Goal(s): Planned Activities***Describe actions the educator will take to attain the student learning goal(s).**Activities may apply to individual and/or team. Attach additional pages as needed.* |
| **Action** | **Supports/Resources From School/District2** | **Timeline, Benchmarks, or Frequency** |
| 2. Use formative assessment results to plan and adjust instruction for each unit. | * Formative assessment results
* Collaboration with ELL specialist
* Weekly science team meetings
 | * Frequency: After each formative unit assessment
* Process benchmark: collaboration and analysis with ELL specialist, plus feedback notes
* Process benchmark: Analysis of student data after each formative assessment, with notes as to how instruction will be adjusted during the next unit
* Outcome benchmark: Lesson plans that target core content standards for each unit and reflect attention to identified student needs based on formative assessments

**Evidence:** pre-unit assessment results and pre-lab reports for Life Science, Earth Science, and Physical Science units; annotated lesson plans (reflecting formative assessment data and feedback from ELL specialist); team meeting notes (when relevant to formative data and lesson planning); meeting notes from ELL specialist; parent communications via email and/or phone |
| 3. Disaggregate unit assessment data for Intermediate and Advanced ELL students and identify proportion that mastered content standards within each unit. | * Unit assessment results
* Collaboration with ELL specialist
* Weekly science team meetings
 | * Frequency: After each unit assessment
* Process benchmark: Tracking form of student mastery of core content standards within each unit
* Outcome benchmark: Completed/updated tracking form of unit assessment results, with analysis of ELL student growth data

**Evidence:** post-lab reports (2 labs per unit), post-unit assessment results, and analysis of end-of-course writing assessments; student notebook excerpts (reflection & self-assessment sections for each unit); team meeting notes (when relevant to formative data and lesson planning); meeting notes from ELL specialist  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Professional Practice Goal(s): Planned Activities***Describe actions the educator will take to attain the professional practice goal(s).**Activities may apply to individual and/or team. Attach additional pages as needed.* |
| **Action** | **Supports/ Resources From School/District[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Timeline, Benchmarks, or Frequency** |
| 4. Research evidence-based instructional strategies that target vocabulary development and academic language with ELL students. Identify a minimum of two instructional strategies for use in my classroom. | * Weekly science team meetings
* ELL specialist
 | * By Oct 1, read *Teaching Basic & Advanced Vocabulary* by Marzano and share insights with science team
* By Oct 1, meet with ELL specialist to discuss evidence-based instructional strategies for teaching academic language and vocabulary to ELL students
* By Oct 15, identify two instructional strategies to use in my classroom

**Evidence:**  team meeting notes; meeting notes from ELL specialist |
| 5. Pilot two instructional strategies related to teaching symbols, key terms, and other domain-specific works and phrases effectively with ELL students. Use weekly checks to measure student mastery of new vocabulary and/or scientific language. | * Weekly science team meetings
 | * Frequency: Weekly meetings
* Process benchmark: Include weekly vocabulary in Monday lesson plans as well as instructional strategy that will be used to teach it
* Process benchmark: Weekly analysis of “do now” activities to assess student mastery of new vocabulary and/or scientific language and determine effectiveness of instructional strategy. Make adjustments if needed.
* Outcome benchmark: Implemented lesson plans that incorporate identified instructional strategies
* Outcome benchmark: Improved mastery of scientific vocabulary and discourse by Intermediate and Advanced ELL students with possible cause/effect relationship to specific instructional strategy
* Outcome benchmark: “bank” of effective resources/instructional strategies to inform future ELL science instruction

**Evidence:** lesson plans (reflecting agreed-upon instructional strategies); “do now” activities tracking comprehension patterns |

Educator Plan is “designed to provide educators with feedback for improvement, professional growth, and leadership,” is “aligned to statewide Standards and Indicators in 603 CMR 35.00 and local Performance Standards,” and “is consistent with district and school goals.” (See [603 CMR 35.06 (3)(d)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06) and [603 CMR 35.06(3)(f).](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06))

Signature of Evaluator P. Randolph Date 9/23/11

Signature of Educator T. Wilson Date 9/23/11

\* As the evaluator retains final authority over goals to be included in an educator’s plan (see [603 CMR 35.06(3)(c)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06)), the signature of the educator indicates that he or she has received the Educator Goal Setting form with the “Final Goals” box checked, indicating the evaluator’s approval of the goals. The educator’s signature does not necessarily denote agreement with the goals. Regardless of agreement with the final goals, signature indicates recognition that “It is the educator’s responsibility to attain the goals in the plan and to participate in any trainings and professional development provided through the state, district, or other providers in accordance with the Educator Plan.” (See [603 CMR 35.06(4)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06).)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Possible Artifacts | Selected Artifacts |
| 1. lesson plans
 | 1. 5 lesson plans (annotated w/ notes reflecting ELL specialist feedback; representing targeted instructional strategies)
 |
| 1. Student notebook excerpts
 | 1. Student notebook excerpts: reflection & self-assessment sections for each of three units
 |
| 1. daily “do now” activities from students
 | 1. daily “do now” activities from students (tracking comprehension patterns)
 |
| 1. ~~Word Walls (weekly snap shots)~~
 |  |
| 1. Pre-lab reports
2. Post-lab reports
 | 1. Analysis of ELL progress from 6 pre-lab reports (identifying and defining relevant academic vocabulary for that lab) to corresponding post-lab reports (summative descriptions of lab findings using relevant academic vocab in context)
 |
| 1. ~~Extensions to curriculum units (when necessary to provide students with deeper knowledge of a concept~~
 |  |
| 1. Pre-unit assessments for Life Sciences, Earth Science, and Physical Science
2. Post-unit assessments for Life Sciences, Earth Science, and Physical Science
 | 1. Analysis of pre- to post-unit assessments for Life Sciences, Earth Science, and Physical Science
 |
| 1. End-of-course writing assessments (format: persuasive essays)
 | 1. Analysis of end-of-course writing assessments from ELL students (format: persuasive essays)
 |
| 1. Monthly science team meeting notes (Oct—March)
 | 1. Science team meeting notes that reflect data analysis and/or discussion of evidence-based instructional strategies for ELLs
 |
| 1. parent email correspondence
 | 1. Parent email and phone correspondence re: ELL student performance and homework needs
 |
| 1. monthly parent phone log
 |

1. Must identify means for educator to receive feedback for improvement per [603 CMR 35.06(3)(d)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)